



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

sister, very clearly implies such converse. He takes occasion, in reply to some friends who had upbraided him for allowing Sidney's name "to sleep in silence and forgetfulness" (Sidney had then been dead some four or five years), to emphasize his "entire love and humble affection unto that most brave knight,"—the seeds of which affection, he says, "taking roote, began in his life time some what to bud forth, and to shew themselves to him, as then in the weakenes of their first spring; and would in their riper strength (had it pleased high God till then to drawe out his daies) have spired forth fruit of more perfection." In the envoy, again, he reasserts his love for his friend:

Immortall spirite of Philisides,  
Which now art made the heavens ornament,  
That whilome wast the worldes chiefst riches,  
Give leave to him that lov'de thee to lament  
His losse.

Is it likely that Spenser would have expressed himself thus had his affection for Sidney not been real? And, granting that it was real, is there any likelihood that it would ever have come into being if Spenser had never had any opportunity for familiar converse with Sidney? The fact that Spenser waited some four or five years after Sidney's death before publishing any poetical lament for him proves nothing as to the character of his affection. It may be that he had good and sufficient reasons for not publishing before he did.

EDWARD FULTON.

*University of Illinois.*

#### NOTES ON THE ANGLO-SAXON *Andreas*

125-8. From the clumsiness of these lines as they stand in the manuscript several editors have found refuge in a parenthesis. The general sense of the passage is clear enough. The syntax would be simplified and the punctuation made somewhat more obvious by transposing lines 127, 128:

Duguð samnade,  
hæðne hildfreca      hæpum þrungon,  
bolgenmōde,      under bordhréoðan;  
gūðsearo gullon,      gāras hrysedon.

For the intransitive use of *hrysedon*, cf. Laŕamon 15946, *þe eorðe gon to rusien* = *þe eorþe gan to cwakie* of the later text; 18868 *beornes scullen rusien*; and 26917 *riseden burnen*.

301        Næbbe ic fæted gold        nē feohgestrēon,  
             welan nē wiste        nē wira gespann,  
             landes nē locenra bēaga.

For the dependence of the genitives *landes nē locenra bēaga* on an implied noun cf. *Judith* 158, 330:

                                 þæt ēow is wuldorblæd  
torhtlic tōweard        and tīr gifeðe  
þāra lǣðða<sup>1</sup>        þe gē lange drugon;  
                                 wægon and lǣddon  
tō ðære beorhtan byrig        Bethuliam  
helmas and hupseax,        hāre byrnan,  
gūðsceorp gumena        golde gefrætewod,  
mǣrra mādma        þonne mon ænig  
asecgan mæge.

Although Shipley (*The Genitive Case in Anglo-Saxon*, p. 48) has noted and translated the passage in *Andreas*, he has not, so far as I can discover, made any comment on the two passages in *Judith*.

807-9. These lines recent editors print without punctuation. It seems better, however, to put a comma after *ēadwelan*, a verb of motion being supplied with *hēt*. Other examples are cited in Bosworth-Toller. Then *sēcan* is parallel with the verb supplied. Root's translation shows the construction: 'bade them forthwith return to blessedness, to seek a second time,' etc.

846. Wülker's facsimile shows the reading of the manuscript to be *þām*, the mark over *a* in *þā* being short and almost horizontal, quite unlike the longer slanting mark sometimes used to denote length. Perhaps the scribe made the wrong kind of mark. The reading *þā* seems preferable.

1124-5. In these and the following lines Krapp finds a striking grotesqueness: "an army is called together with all the accompaniments of battle for the purpose of devouring their single victim." Is 'army' quite the word here? Is not this interpretation too formal? Although *here samnodan* may be a technical military expression and although military phraseology, suggestions of warfare and

<sup>1</sup> Imelmann, *Beiblatt*, xix, 7, translates, 'Euch ist ruhm verliehen für die leiden, die ihr lange ertragen.'

battle, may abound throughout the poem (see Krapp's summary and references, p. lii), I prefer a simpler interpretation which largely does away with the grotesqueness.

Now *here* and *folc* are more or less interchangeable. In *Maldon* 22 and 45 *folc* means 'army'; in the *Paris Psalter* lxxviii, 10, *þȳ læs æfre cweðan oðre þēoda hǣðene herigeas* translates *nequando dicant in gentibus*; in *Andreas* 652 and *Menologium* 5 *sīde herigeas* = *folc unmāte*; and in *Andreas* 1198 *þissum herige* refers to *folc* of 1196. In 1123 therefore *here* = *folc*, with the connotation (common of course from the use of *here* in the *Chronicle*) of horde or rabble bent on destruction and slaughter. If then we translate, 'the heathen priests gathered together a mob of citizens,' and remember that a mob is likely to shout, to be armed, and to demand a victim, we may find no incongruity in the passage.

It is possible, though perhaps far-fetched, that *for herige* in l. 1127 means not 'before the crowd or host,' as the phrase is usually taken, but 'before the temple or altar' (dat. sg. of *hearh*), the temple being not specifically mentioned but implied in *herigweardas* 1124.

1358-9. Root translates, 'have words ready devised against that wicked wretch'; Hall, 'make ready now with well-chosen words for the wicked impostor.' But 'words' here is too colorless. Though a speech follows, *habbað word gearu* means more than 'be prepared to say something'; it rather implies take 'special precautions' against the superior power implied in *æglæca*, which Krapp here defines as 'magician.' We may, then, translate, 'have a spell or charm ready against the wizard.'

Something of the same idea may be present in *wordum* 1053.

1460. I suggest that *cræfta gehygd*, 'thought of crafts,' means 'crafty thoughts.' The phrase resembles *wuldres þrēat*, 870, 'throng of glory' = 'glorious throng,' and Hamlet's 'thieves of mercy' = 'merciful thieves' (iv, 6, 19). The reference seems to be to the craft implied in *æglæca* 1359.

1605-6. *Gumcystum* must be dat. pl. of *gumcyst*, a noun; yet the sense seems to require an adjective: 'there is now great need that we earnestly listen to (heed) the excellent man.' Accordingly I propose to read *gumcystgum*, dat. pl. of *gumcystig*. In the same way Krapp, following his note in *Modern Philology*, II, 404, changes *synne* 109 to *synnige*, explaining that "The ms. has regu-

larly the unsyncopated forms of this word; the form *synne* perhaps looks back to a time when the syncopated forms were still written." The remark may be applied to *gumcystum* as a syncopated form of *gumcystgum* or *gumcystigum*.

B. S. MONROE.

Cornell University.

### THE AUTHORSHIP OF *Gorboduc*

Dangerous as it is to decide matters of literary authorship on internal evidence, it may at times be tried, especially if the period be one where literary language, not being the possession of the many, was more likely to bear the imprint of the few.

The argument of those critics who refuse to admit the joint authorship of Norton and Sackville is weak enough, in fact it is hardly more than a negation against contemporary evidence unimpeached at the time. Basing their claim, just as Warton did, on "the force of internal evidence," none of his followers could fairly challenge the methods by which F. Koch, Miss Toulmin Smith, and Mr. H. A. Watt have tried (the men with more zeal than the woman) to support the printer's assertion (see *Gorboduc; or Ferrex and Porrex*, by H. A. Watt, Madison, Wisconsin, 1910, Chapter v and bibliography).

It may be that a minuter examination than has thus far been made would bring to light more internal evidence in favor of a, if not of the joint authorship.

Whilst re-reading the play a short time ago, some peculiarities struck me, which at first had entirely escaped my attention. The chief one is certain *tripartition* in the sense and in the sound of a number of lines. It is surprising that, so far as I know, attention should not yet have been called to this point. In a drama which Sidney praised for "clyming to the height of Seneca his stile" it would seem natural to look for traces of the well-known rhetorical *trikolon*.<sup>1</sup> I shall only quote the most convincing lines. (The quotations are from J. W. Cunliffe's *Early English Classical Tragedies*, Oxford, 1912).

- I, 1. Murders, / mischiefe, / or ciuill sword at length (62)
- I, 2. To me / and myne, / and to your natie lande (28)
- For you, / for yours, / and for our natie lande (40)
- Whose honours, / goods / and lyues are all auowed
- To serue, / to ayde, / and to defende your grace (44-45)
- For kinges, / for kingdomes, / and for common weales (48)
- And thinke it good for me, / for them, / for you (70)

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Norden, *Die antike Kunstprosa*, I, 289 ff.).